arXiv:1612.01774v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 6 Dec 2016

Exact solution for the inhomogeneous Dicke model in the canonical ensemble: large-particle limit and finite-size corrections

W. V. Pogosov[1,2,3], L. V. Bork[1,4], A. I. Onishchenko[5,3,6], D. S. Shapiro[1,3,7,8]

[1] *N. L. Dukhov All-Russia Research Institute of Automatics, Moscow, Russia*

[2] *Institute for Theoretical and Applied Electrodynamics, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia*

[3] *Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Dolgoprudny, Russia*

[4] *Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia*

[5] *Bogoliubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia*

[6] *Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia*

[7] *V. A. Kotel'nikov Institute of Radio Engineering and Electronics, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia and*

[8] *National University of Science and Technology MISIS, Moscow, Russia*

We consider an exactly solvable inhomogeneous Dicke model which describes an interaction between a disordered ensemble of two-level systems with single mode boson field. The existing method for evaluation of Richardson-Gaudin equations in the thermodynamical limit is extended to the case of Bethe equations in Dicke model. Using this extension, we calculate both the ground state and lowest excited states energies as well as leading-order finite-size corrections to these quantities for an arbitrary distribution of individual spin energies.

PACS numbers: 02.30Ik, 42.50.Ct, 03.65.Fd

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent progress in engineering of artificial quantum systems for information technologies renewed an interest to Dicke (Tavis-Cummings) model [1] and its exact solution, already well known for a long time [2–5]. Dicke model describes an interaction between a collection of two-level systems and single mode radiation field, while physical realizations range from superconducting qubits coupled to microwave resonators to polaritons in quantum wells, see e.g. Refs. [6, 7] and references therein; furthermore, it can be also applied to Fermi-Bose condensates near the Feshbach resonance [8].

The characteristic feature of macroscopic artificial quantum systems such as superconducting qubits is a disorder in excitation frequencies and inhomogeneous broadening of the density of states. This feature is due to fundamental mechanisms: for example, an excitation energy of flux qubits depends exponentially on Josephson energies [9], which makes it extremely sensitive to characteristics of nanometer scale Josephson junctions. Inhomogeneous broadening appears even in the case of microscopic two-level systems, such as NV-centers, where it is induced by spatial fluctuations of background magnetic moments [10]. Moreover, there are prospect to utilize this broadening for the construction of a multimodal quantum memory [11].

Inhomogeneous Dicke model, which explicitly takes into account a disorder in excitation energies, has been studied in Ref. [12] using a mean-field treatment in the thermodynamical limit. This study revealed an existence of a rather rich phase diagram including a finite gap in the energy spectrum between the first excited state and the ground state in a closed analogy with the superconducting gap in the Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer theory of superconductivity, while the mean-field approximation also becomes exact in the thermodynamical limit of the model. However, this approximation is expected to fail in the mesoscopic regime, which seems to be more relevant for near-future technological applications. Indeed, structures, which consist of tens or hundreds of superconducting qubits and show signatures of global coherence, have been successfully fabricated and explored very recently [6, 13].

The mesoscopic regime of the Dicke model as well as the emergence of the macroscopic limit can be properly described only within a canonical ensemble, which takes into account that the 'particle' number is fixed, while this

circumstance makes it difficult to apply standard mean-field methods. By 'particle' number one should understand the total number of bosons and excited two-level systems (spins). The limiting validity of grand canonical description is well known in the case of pairing correlations in ultrasmall metallic systems at low temperatures and in nuclei, for which usual mean-field approximation can give results inadequate even on a qualitative level [14]. For example, it predicts vanishing of superconducting correlations at certain mean interlevel distance upon the decrease of system size, while more advanced approaches show that they never disappear. One of such approaches is to make use of the exactly solvable Richardson-Gaudin model [2, 15]: it provides a solution to the Schrödinger equation via Bethe ansatz technique and was utilized to evaluate various characteristics along the crossover from few-particle systems to the macroscopic regime, see, e.g., Ref. [16] and references therein. In particular, finite-size corrections can be elaborated iteratively using the Richardson method based on the resolution of Bethe equations in the thermodynamical limit [17, 18]. For an example of a recent application of this exact solution for the evaluation of form factors, see Ref. [19], while the extension of this approach to other pairing models was reported in Ref. [20].

Dicke model belongs to the same class of exactly solvable quantum models as Richardson and Gaudin models [2, 21–23]. To a certain extent, it can be viewed as Richardson model in which interaction between spins is mediated by a bosonic degree of freedom. However, in contrast to the Richardson model, Dicke model supports arbitrarily large number of 'particles' through this degree of freedom. This fact sometimes makes it not so straightforward to apply ideas relevant for Richardson-Gaudin models to the Dicke model, see, e.g., recent developments on the particle-hole duality [24–26]. The phase diagram of the inhomogeneous Dicke model in the thermodynamical limit is much richer, since it contains larger number of controlling parameters which include 'particle' density, mean detuning between the spin and boson energies, as well as spin-boson coupling energy. For instance, for Gaussian distribution of individual spin energies, the phase diagram includes points where a gap in the excitation spectrum vanishes [12], so that finite-size corrections should be of a particular importance.

The aim of the present paper is to construct a solution of Bethe equations for inhomogeneous Dicke model in the thermodynamical limit in the spirit of the approach developed by Richardson, as well as to evaluate, within the canonical ensemble, leading finite-size corrections both to the ground state energy and low-energy excited states. This is done for a completely generic distribution of individual spin energies. Although we basically follow the approach of Richardson [17], many aspects of the derivation are different, since Bethe equations for Dicke model include a term of a new (divergent) type, which changes the multipole expansion encoded into the approach.

II. PRELIMINARIES

We consider a Hamiltonian of the form

$$H = \sum_{n}^{L} 2\epsilon_n s_n^z + \omega b^\dagger b + g \sum_{n}^{L} (b^\dagger s_n^- + b s_n^+), \tag{1}$$

where $b^\dagger$ and b correspond to the boson degree of freedom:

$$[b, b^\dagger] = 1, \tag{2}$$

while s_n^z and $s_n^\pm$ correspond to the paulion degrees of freedom and describe a set of L two-level systems:

$$[s_n^+, s_n^-] = 2s_n^z, \tag{3}$$

$$[s_n^z, s_n^\pm] = \pm s_n^\pm. \tag{4}$$

This Hamiltonian commutes with the operator of the total 'particle' number, i.e., the number of bosons plus the number of excited two-level systems. Let us denote this number as M. We then consider a limit $L \to \infty$, while M behaves in the same way, so that M/L is constant. Let us also assume that the density of energies ϵ_n grows at

$L \to \infty$, whereas ω is independent on L and g scales as $1/\sqrt{L}$. For any fixed M, there are different eigenstates of the Hamiltonian. The lowest energy state is the ground state at given M, while others represent excited states.

Bethe equation for each rapidity $e(i)$ (i ranges from 1 to M) reads [2, 21–23]

$$\frac{2e(i)}{g^2} - \frac{\omega}{g^2} + \sum_{j\neq i}^{M} \frac{1}{e(i)-e(j)} - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{n}^{L} \frac{1}{e(i)-\epsilon_n} = 0, \tag{5}$$

while the energy of the system is expressed through the roots $e(i)$ as

$$E = 2\sum_{i}^{M} e(i). \tag{6}$$

There exists a two-dimensional electrostatic analogy for the set of Bethe equations (5), which may be treated as equilibrium conditions for the Coulomb plasma [2, 17]. Roots $e(i)$ can be interpreted as locations of M free charges of unit strength in the complex plane. They repeal each other, but at the same time they are also attracted by L fixed charges of $-1/2$ strength positioned at ϵ_n on real axis. In addition, free charges are subjected into two forces produced by the uniform external field $-\omega/g^2$ and by parabolic confining potential $2e(i)/g^2$. The last term is absent in both Richardson and Gaudin models. Note that the analogy with the Coulomb plasma can be used to construct a kind of a probabilistic approach to the solution of Richardson-Gaudin equations [24], but we are not going to pursue this issue here.

III. FIELD EQUATION

Let us consider a function

$$F(z) = \sum_{j} \frac{1}{z-e(j)} - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{n} \frac{1}{z-\epsilon_n} - \frac{\omega}{g^2} + \frac{2z}{g^2}, \tag{7}$$

which represents an electrostatic field of the whole system of charges.

Using (5), it is not difficult to find that F satisfies the equation

$$F^2 + \frac{dF}{dz} = \frac{2}{g^2} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{n} \frac{1}{(z-\epsilon_n)^2} + \left(\frac{1}{2}\sum_{n} \frac{1}{z-\epsilon_n} + \frac{\omega}{g^2} - \frac{2z}{g^2}\right)^2 + \frac{4M}{g^2} - \sum_{n} \frac{H(n)}{z-\epsilon_n}. \tag{8}$$

where

$$H(n) = -\sum_{j} \frac{1}{e(j)-\epsilon_n}. \tag{9}$$

It can be rewritten as

$$H(n) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_{C_e} \frac{F(z)dz}{z-\epsilon_n}, \tag{10}$$

where a closed contour C_e encloses all the singularities of F coming from poles at all roots $e(j)$ and excludes those one which are due to the set of energies ϵ_k.

Let us represent $F(z)$ as a multipole expansion

$$F(z) = \sum_{s=-1}^{\infty} F^{(s)} z^{-s}. \tag{11}$$

By substituting this expansion into (8), we find

$$F^{(-1)} = 2/g^2, \tag{12}$$

$$F^{(0)} = -\omega/g^2, \tag{13}$$

$$F^{(1)} = (2M - L)/2, \tag{14}$$

$$F^{(2)} = -\tfrac{g^2}{4}\textstyle\sum_n H(n) - \tfrac{1}{2}\sum_n \epsilon_n + \tfrac{M\omega}{2}. \tag{15}$$

The first three relations satisfy Eq. (7) automatically. Using (7), we also find that $F^{(2)}$ can be represented as

$$F^{(2)} = \sum_j e(j) - \frac{1}{2}\sum_n \epsilon_n. \tag{16}$$

By comparing (15) and (16), we find

$$\sum_j e(j) = -\frac{g^2}{4}\sum_n H(n) + \frac{M\omega}{2}. \tag{17}$$

We also expand $F(z)$, $H(n)$, and E in powers of $1/L$ as $F(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} F_k(z)$, where $F_0 \sim L$. For the first three terms, we obtain from the field equation

$$F_0^2 = \frac{4M}{g^2} + \left(\frac{1}{2}\sum_n \frac{1}{z-\epsilon_n} + \frac{\omega}{g^2} - \frac{2z}{g^2}\right)^2 - \sum_n \frac{H_0(n)}{z-\epsilon_n}. \tag{18}$$

$$2F_0F_1 = \frac{1}{2}\sum_n \frac{1}{(z-\epsilon_n)^2} - \sum_n \frac{H_1(n)}{z-\epsilon_n} - \frac{dF_0}{dz} + \frac{2}{g^2}. \tag{19}$$

$$2F_0F_2 = -\sum_n \frac{H_2(n)}{z-\epsilon_n} - F_1^2 - \frac{dF_1}{dz}, \tag{20}$$

where

$$H_k(n) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_{C_e} \frac{F_k(z)dz}{z-\epsilon_n}. \tag{21}$$

IV. GROUND STATE

It is further assumed that free charges in $L \to \infty$ limit merge into a line of charge, so that the poles of F due to the first term in (7) form a branch cut, which extends from point $a = \lambda + i\Delta$ to $a^* = \lambda - i\Delta$ in the complex plane. Let us consider the following ansatz for F_0

$$F_0 = -\frac{Z}{2}\left(\sum_n \frac{1}{\eta_n(z-\epsilon_n)} - \frac{1}{\xi^2}\right), \tag{22}$$

where

$$Z = \sqrt{(z-a)(z-a^*)},$$
$$\eta_n = \sqrt{(\varepsilon_n - a)(\varepsilon_n - a^*)} = \sqrt{(\varepsilon_n - \lambda)^2 + \Delta^2}. \tag{23}$$

This ansatz readily follows once we take into account that F_0 has a single cut on an interval $[a, a^*]$ and poles with known residues at ϵ_n and infinity.

By substituting (22) to (18), we find that (22) is indeed a solution provided three relations are satisfied:

$$\frac{1}{\xi^2} = \frac{4}{g^2}, \tag{24}$$

$$\sum_n \frac{1}{\eta_n} = \frac{2}{g^2}(\omega - 2\lambda), \tag{25}$$

$$\sum_n \frac{\epsilon_n - \lambda}{\eta_n} = \frac{2\Delta^2}{g^2} + (L - 2M). \tag{26}$$

Last two equations are actually gap equation and the equation for the chemical potential, which were obtained before in the thermodynamical limit in Ref. [12] using mean-field method. These two equations must be solved together. Note that when deriving them we used the following relation

$$H(n) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i}\left(\oint_{C_{e,\epsilon}} \frac{F(z)dz}{z - \epsilon_n} - \oint_{C_\epsilon} \frac{F(z)dz}{z - \epsilon_n}\right), \tag{27}$$

where a closed contour $C_{e,\epsilon}$ clockwises around all the singularities of F coming from poles at all roots $e(j)$ as well as all energies ϵ, while C_ϵ includes only all energies ϵ. For the first integral in the right-hand side of the above equation we use the expression of $F(z)$ given by (7). We then find

$$H(n) = -\frac{2\epsilon_n}{g^2} + \frac{\omega}{g^2} + \frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_{C_\epsilon} \frac{F(z)dz}{z - \epsilon_n}, \tag{28}$$

where for the last integral in a leading order we may use the ansatz (22).

Using the same representation for $H(n)$, we find the ground state energy in the leading order, according to (17),

$$E_{ground0} = \sum_n (\epsilon_n - \eta_n) + \lambda(2M - L) + \frac{\Delta^2}{g^2}(\omega - 2\lambda). \tag{29}$$

V. FINITE-SIZE CORRECTIONS TO THE GROUND STATE ENERGY

Let us now turn to Eq. (19) for F_1. The set of quantities $H_1(n)$ can be determined by requirement that F_1 does not introduce any new charges located on real axis, so that F_0 describes all such charges. As follows from Eq. (19), this is possible only if the right-hand side vanishes at real zeros x_l of F_0, otherwise F_1 has poles at these zeros. In contrast to the Richardson model, the number of zeros x_l is equal to the number of energy levels, i.e., to L, as it is clear from Eq. (22).

Thus, we require that the right-hand side of equation (19) vanishes at $z = x_l$. By substituting (22) to (19) at $z = x_l$ and representing $H_1(n)$ as

$$H_1(n) = \frac{1}{\eta_n}\sum_l \frac{h_1(l)}{x_l - \epsilon_n}, \tag{30}$$

we find

$$h_1(l) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{N_l}{D_l} - \zeta_l\right), \tag{31}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_l &= \sqrt{(x_l - a)(x_l - a^*)}, \\ N_l &= \frac{4}{g^2} + \sum_n \frac{1}{(x_l - \epsilon_n)^2}, \\ D_l &= \sum_n \frac{1}{\eta_n}\frac{1}{(x_l - \epsilon_n)^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

In order to find a first-order correction to the energy, we need to obtain $\frac{g^2}{4}\sum_l H_1(l)$ which reduces to $\sum_l h_1(l)$. This sum can be evaluated by using Eq. (31) and by simplifying the ratio of sums (see., e.g., Ref. [18]). Finally, we obtain

$$E_{ground1} = \sum_l \zeta_l - \sum_n \eta_n + \frac{1}{2}(2\lambda - \omega). \tag{33}$$

A similar approach can be used to simplify the expression of F_1 using Eqs. (19) and (31). After some algebra, we arrive at

$$F_1 = \frac{1}{2Z}\left(\sum_n \frac{z+\epsilon_n-2\lambda}{Z+\eta_n} - \sum_l \frac{z+x_l-2\lambda}{Z+\zeta_l} - \frac{z-\lambda}{Z} + 1\right). \tag{34}$$

Note that F_1 has no monopole moment.

VI. EXCITED STATES

Let us consider a state with one isolated free charge out of the line of charges. We denote the total field due to all charges as $F'(z)$. It satisfies Eq. (8). The field due to the isolated charge located at $e(1)$ is $1/(z-e(1))$. We expand $e(1)$ in power series in $1/L$ as $e(1) = e_1 + e_2$. Then, we split F' into the contribution from this isolated charge and remaining charges $\overline{F'}$

$$F' = \overline{F'} + \frac{1}{z-e(1)}. \tag{35}$$

We expect that the substraction of a single charge from the whole system of charges does not change the total field in the leading order. Hence, we can write

$$\overline{F'} = F_0 + \overline{F_1'}. \tag{36}$$

Thus, the total first-order correction to F_0 is $\frac{1}{z-e(1)} + \overline{F_1'}$. It must satisfy Eq. (19). Let us represent it as

$$2F_0\overline{F_1'} = -\frac{dF_0}{dz} + \frac{2}{g^2} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_n \frac{1}{(z-\epsilon_n)^2} - \sum_n \frac{H_1'(n)}{z-\epsilon_n} - 2F_0\frac{1}{z-e_1}. \tag{37}$$

The function $\overline{F_1'}$ should not have poles on real axis. Therefore, e_1 has to coincide with one of the zeros x_l of F_0.

If $z = x_m$ and $m \neq l$, we have from (37) the same equation as previously. However, for $z = x_l$ we have a modified equation

$$\sum_n \frac{H_1'(n)}{x_l-\epsilon_n} = -3\frac{dF_0}{dz}(z=x_l) + \frac{2}{g^2} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_n \frac{1}{(x_l-\epsilon_n)^2}, \tag{38}$$

where we used an identity

$$\frac{F_0(z)}{z-x_l}(z\to x_l) = \frac{dF_0}{dz}(z=x_l) \tag{39}$$

Simple algebra shows that a contribution to the total energy due to this quantity is $2\zeta_l = 2\sqrt{(x_l-\lambda)^2+\Delta^2}$. This is nothing but the excitation energy in leading order. It is worth mentioning that x_l has to be confined between two neighboring energies ϵ, so that in the thermodynamical limit x_l can be replaced by ϵ due to the infinite density of these energy levels. Thus, the above result for the excitation energy together with gap equation and the equation for the chemical potential (26) fully agree with the previously found [12] result for the low-lying part of the energy spectrum, $2\sqrt{(\epsilon-\lambda)^2+\Delta^2}$, which is similar to the well known result of Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer theory of superconductivity.

Note that in this theory chemical potential resides exactly in the middle of the interaction band, so that the equation for the chemical potential is fulfilled automatically and therefore is dropped; however, it must be kept in the situation of a crossover from local Bose-condensed pairs to the dense condensate [27, 28]. Mean field results for the low-lying part of energy spectrum are exact in the thermodynamical limit both for Richardson and inhomogeneous Dicke models.

A correction to the field can be found from (37) as

$$F_1' - F_1 = \frac{\zeta_l}{Z}\frac{1}{z - x_l}. \tag{40}$$

Now we calculate a correction e_2 to the position of the isolated charge. The Bethe equation for $e(1)$ is $\overline{F'}(e_1 + e_2) = 0$. It can be rewritten as

$$\overline{F'}(x_l + e_2) \simeq \overline{F'}(x_l) + e_2\left(\frac{d\overline{F'}}{dz}\right)_{z=x_l} \simeq F_0(x_l) + \overline{F_1'}(x_l) + e_2\left(\frac{dF_0}{dz}\right)_{z=x_l} = \overline{F_1'}(x_l) + e_2\left(\frac{dF_0}{dz}\right)_{z=x_l} = 0, \tag{41}$$

from which we find

$$e_2 = -\overline{F_1'}(x_l)/\left(\frac{dF_0}{dz}\right)_{z=x_l} = \frac{1}{\zeta_l D_l}\left(\frac{x_l - \lambda}{\zeta_l^2} - F_1(x_l)\right). \tag{42}$$

VII. FINITE-SIZE CORRECTIONS TO EXCITED STATES ENERGIES

Let us turn to F_2 given by Eq. (20). We again require that the right-hand side of this equation vanishes at zeros of F_0 and find

$$h_2(l) = -\frac{1}{D_l}\left(F_1(x_l)^2 + \frac{dF_1(x_l)}{dz}\right). \tag{43}$$

The correction F_2' to the total field of a system of charges (line of charges and an isolated charge) is

$$F_2' = \overline{F_2'} + \frac{e_2}{(z - x_l)^2}, \tag{44}$$

where $\overline{F_2'}$ is a correction to the field produced by a line of charges. F_2' has to satisfy Eq. (20) with F_1' used instead of F_1. Thus, we obtain

$$2F_0\overline{F_2'} = -2F_0\frac{e_2}{(z - x_l)^2} - F_1' - \frac{dF_1'}{dz} - \sum_n \frac{H_2'(n)}{z - \epsilon_n}. \tag{45}$$

The right-hand side of this equation must vanish at zeros of F_0. Using this condition, after some algebra, we find a correction to the excited state energy as

$$E_2' - E_2 = \frac{1}{D_l}\left((\overline{F_1'}^2 - F_1^2) + \frac{d}{dz}(3\overline{F_1'} - F_1) + e_2\frac{d^2F_0}{dz^2}\right)_{z=x_l} + \sum_{m\neq l}\frac{1}{D_m}\left((\overline{F_1'}^2 - F_1^2) + \frac{d}{dz}(\overline{F_1'} - F_1) + \frac{2\overline{F_1'}}{z - x_l}\right)_{z=x_m} \tag{46}$$

The above expressions for the corrections to the ground state energy and excited state energies are completely generic, so that various distributions of spin energies ϵ can be used to evaluate these corrections. The most physically meaningful distributions of the density of states is the Gaussian distribution [12], since it directly applies to the disorder-induced broadening. It might be supplemented by a lower cut-off, where the density of states is continuous in order to avoid some nonphysical effects [12]. The simplified equally-spaced distribution of ϵ between the two cut-offs would be also of interest. The calculations for such a distribution for the case of Richardson model were performed in Ref. [18]. Detailed calculations for the Dicke model involving different types of density of states distributions will be presented elsewhere, while here we limit ourselves on general results.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

Dicke model, which is well known from quantum optics, is directly related to the family of Richardson-Gaudin models and may be viewed as their extension, since they represent certain limiting cases of Dicke model. Bethe equations for Richardson-Gaudin models in the thermodynamical limit can be solved explicitly using an approach developed by Gaudin [2] and Richardson [17] decades ago. Moreover, this approach allows for an iterative evaluation of finite-size corrections both to the ground state and lowest excited state energies. Such corrections are of importance for the crossover region from the few-'particle' limit of the system to the macroscopic regime.

In the present article, we extended the method of Richardson [17] to Bethe equations for the Dicke model. Namely, we have determined the low-lying part of the energy spectrum as well as leading order finite-size corrections for a completely generic distribution of individual spin energies. These results can be applied for the crossover from the thermodynamical limit, which is correctly described by the mean-field approximation, to the fluctuation-dominated regime in small systems. They also provide an additional link between the Dicke model and the Richardson-Gaudin family of models.

Our findings might be of importance in the context of engineering and studies of artificial quantum systems, such as ensembles of superconducting qubits, interacting coherently with quantized electromagnetic field, which attract considerable current interest due to the perspectives of application in quantum information technologies.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by RFBR (projects nos. 15-02-02128 and 14-02-00494), by Ministry of Education and Science of Russia (grants nos. 14.Y26.31.0007 and 02.A03.21.0003 from 27.08.2013), and by Russian Science Foundation (contract no. 16-12-00095). D. S. S. also acknowledges a support by the Fellowship of the President of Russian Federation for young scientists (fellowship no. SP-2044.2016.5).

[1] R. H. Dicke, Phys. Rev. 93 (1954) 99.
[2] M. Gaudin, J. Phys. (Paris) 37 (1976) 1087.
[3] K. Hepp and E. H. Lieb, Ann. Phys. (NY) 76 (1983) 453.
[4] A. M. Tsvelick and P. B. Wiegmann, Adv. Physics 32 (1983) 453.
[5] V. I. Rupasov and V. I. Yudson, JETP 60 (1984) 927.
[6] A. M. Zagoskin, D. Felbacq, and E. Rousseau, EPJ Quantum Tech. 3 (2016) 2.
[7] R. Balili, V. Hartwell, D. Snoke, L. Pfeiffer, and K. West, Science 316 (2007) 1007.
[8] A. V. Andreev, V. Gurarie, and L. Radzihovsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93 (2004) 130402.
[9] Yu. Makhlin, G. Schön, and A. Shnirman, Rev. Mod. Phys. 73 (2001) 357.
[10] P. L. Stanwix, L. M. Pham, J. R. Maze, D. Le Sage, T. K. Yeung, P. Cappellaro, P. R. Hemmer, A. Yacoby, M. D. Lukin, and R. L. Walsworth, Phys. Rev. B 82 (2010) 201201(R).
[11] J. H. Wesenberg, Z. Kurucz, and K. Mølmer, Phys. Rev. A 83 (2011) 023826.
[12] P. R. Eastham and P. B. Littlewood, Phys. Rev. B 64 (2001) 235101.
[13] P. Macha, G. Oelsner, J.-M. Reiner, M. Marthaler, S. André, G. Schön, U. Hübner, H.-G. Meyer, E. Ilichev, and A. V. Ustinov, Nat. Commun. 5 (2014) 5146.
[14] J. von Delft and D. C. Ralph, Phys. Rep. 345 (2001) 61.
[15] R. W. Richardson, Phys. Lett. 3 (1963) 277.
[16] M. Schechter, Y. Imry, Y. Levinson, and J. von Delft, Phys. Rev. B 63 (2001) 214518.
[17] R. W. Richardson, J. Math. Phys. 18 (1977) 1802.
[18] E. A. Yuzbashyan, A. A. Baytin, and B. L. Altshuler, Phys. Rev. B 71 (2005) 094505.
[19] G. Gorohovsky and E. Bettelheim, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 47 (2014) 025001.

[20] L. Amico, A. Di Lorenzo, A. Mastellone, A. Osterloh, and R. Raimondi, Ann. Phys. 299 (2002) 228.
[21] O. Babelon and D. Talalaev, J. Stat. Mech. 0706 (2007) 06013.
[22] O. Tsyplyatyev, J. von Delft, and D. Loss, Phys. Rev. B 82 (2010) 092203.
[23] P. W. Claeys, S. De Baerdemacker, M. Van Raemdonck, and D. Van Neck, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 48 (2015) 425201.
[24] W. V. Pogosov, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 24 (2012) 075701.
[25] H. Tschirhart and A. Faribault, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 47 (2014) 405204.
[26] L. V. Bork and W. V. Pogosov, Nucl. Phys. B 897 (2015) 405.
[27] D. M. Eagles, Phys. Rev. 186 (1969) 456.
[28] A. J. Leggett, J. de Physique. Colloques **41**, C7 (1980); A. J. Leggett, *Proceedings of the XVIth Karpacz Winter School of Theoretical Physics, Karpacz, Poland*, pp. 13-27, Springer-Verlag (1980).